


The Examiner rejected only claims 1, 27-36, and 43-44. Applicant requests that the Examiner issue a new office action because these rejections appear not to correspond to the claims as amended in the most recent amendment. Claim 27 depends from claim 19 and it is not clear how it can be rejected over prior art when the parent claim not being rejected. Claims 43 and 44 depend from claim 37. Again, it is not clear how claims 43 and 44 can be rejected over prior art without rejecting the parent claims. Applicant proposes that the numbering used in stating the rejection is not consistent with the claims and requests that the Examiner provide a new office action restating the rejections and grounds therefore. This perception is supported by the fact that the numbering does correspond to the claims as they stood prior to the latest amendment. At that time, claims 27 and 43 were independent.

Also, the Examiner did not address any of the arguments given by the Applicant regarding the relevance of the Kawakami reference, which is the only prior art applied against the claim in the present office action.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner please clarify the rejections or submit a new office action and also that the Examiner, if he rejects any of the claims over Kawakami, please address the Applicant's arguments distinguishing Kawakami.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Mark A. Catan
Registration No. 38,720

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 508-9100
Dated: March 18, 1998